Remarks

Now pending in the application are claims 1-23, of which claims 1, 4, 11, 17, and 21 are independent. The following remarks address all stated grounds for rejection, and Applicants respectfully submit that the presently pending claims, as identified above, are in condition for allowance.

Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11-13, 16-18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11-13, 16-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,012,090 ("Weinberg"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for the following reasons.

The present invention relates to detecting web browser proxy settings that are preventing the proper execution of software facilities, such as applets, embedded in retrieved web pages. For example, independent claims 1, 4, 11 and 17 provide a web page including an embedded software facility that has a reference to a source of computer-executable code for determining a trust proxy setting in a web browser. When the web page is retrieved by the web browser, the embedded software facility may be executed to determine if a proxy server is being utilized by the web browser and if the web browser is configured to accept the results of the proxy textual name equivalence conversion. If a proxy server is being utilized by the web browser and if the proxy setting is not enabled in the web browser, a message may be displayed to the browser user.

Applicant submits that Weinberg does not disclose *a web page with a first embedded software facility, the first embedded software facility including a reference to a source of computer-executable code for determining a trust proxy setting in a web browser*, as recited in claims 1, 4, 11 and 17.

The Examiner asserts in the Office Action that Weinberg discloses the web page of the claimed invention in Figs. 11 and 25 and column 23, line 45 to column 25, line 16. See the Office Action, page 3, lines 1 and 16-17, page 4, lines 15-16, and page 5, lines 12-13. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Weinberg discloses a web site analysis program ("Astra") implemented as a collection of software components. A software component scans a web site over a network connection and builds a site map which graphically depicts the URLs and links of the site. Weinberg also discloses that an Action Tracker module detects user activity and behavioral data (link activity levels, common site entry and exit points, etc.) from server log files and then superimposes such data onto the site map. Weinberg further discloses that a Load Wizard module uses this activity data to generate testing scenarios for load testing the web site.

In Fig. 11, Weinberg discloses a web browser (170) running on a client computer (92) and configured to use the Astra application (94) as an HTTP-level proxy. The web browser (170) generates and passes all HTTP-level messages to Astra (94), which in-turn makes the client requests on behalf of the web browser. Server responses, such as web pages, to the client's requests are returned to Astra, and then forwarded to the browser. When the web site (113) returns a page, Astra adds a corresponding node to the site map, and parses the page to add respective nodes to the map for each outgoing link of the page.

In comparison, the present invention determines true proxy settings in a web browser running on a client computer. In an embodiment of the present invention, a web page may include an applet that is executed to check for the presence of a proxy server on a local network. If the local network is using a proxy server, the applet checks to see if the browser trust proxy setting is enabled. If a proxy server is used, and the trust proxy setting for the browser is not enabled, the applet may cause a notification regarding the trust proxy setting to be displayed to the user of the browser.

In the present application, the term "trust proxy setting" refers to "the setting enabling the web browser to accept the results of the proxy textual name equivalence conversion". See the specification of the pending application, page 4, first paragraph. Applicant submits that the term "trust proxy setting" recited in the claims should be constructed in terms of the definition described in the specification. *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 376 F.3d 1382, 71 USPQ2d 1765 (Fed. Cir. 2004).

Although Weinberg discloses a web site analysis, management or test application (94) that is used as a proxy in a client computer (92), Weinberg does not disclose a web page including an embedded software facility that has a reference to a source of computer-executable code for determining a trust proxy setting in a web browser, as recited in the claimed invention. Weinberg does not disclose detecting true proxy settings in the web browser.

In light of the foregoing arguments, Applicant respectfully submits that Weinberg does not disclose each and every element of independent claims 1, 4, 11 and 17. Applicant therefore requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11-13, and 16-20, and pass the claims to allowance.

Rejection of Claims 3, 10, 19 and 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 3, 10, 19 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Weinberg in view of United States Patent No. 6,035,332 ("Ingrassia"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for the following reasons.

Claims 3, 10 and 19 depend from claims independent claim 1, 4 and 17. Independent claim 21 recites a first web page with a first embedded software facility, the first embedded software facility including a reference to a source of computer-executable code for determining a trust proxy setting in a web browser. Claims 22-23 depend from claim 21.

Applicant respectfully submits that Weinberg and Ingrassia do not teach or suggest *a web page with a first embedded software facility including a reference to a source of computer-executable code for determining a trust proxy setting in a web browser*, as recited in claims 1, 4, 17 and 21.

Ingrassia is cited by the Examiner to provide teachings for the limitations recited in dependent claims, and the limitation of a second web page recited in independent claim 21. Ingrassia teaches tracking and synchronizing user activities on all type of web pages, even the ones from proxy servers. Although Ingrassia teaches tracking user activities on a web page, Ingrassia does not teach a web page with a software facility including a reference to a source

of computer-executable code for determining a trust proxy setting in the web browser, as recited in the claimed invention. Nowhere does Ingrassia mention the determination of true proxy settings in the web browser.

In light of the foregoing arguments, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Weinberg and Ingrassia does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 1, 4, 17 and 21. Claims 3, 10, 19 and 22-23, which depend from one of claims 1, 4, 17 and 21, are not rendered obvious over the cited prior art references. Applicant therefore requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 3, 10, 19 and 21-23, and pass the claims to allowance.

Rejection of Claims 6, 7, 14, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 6, 7, 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Weinberg and Ingrassia in view of United States Patent No. 6,366,949 ("Hubert"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for the following reasons.

Claims 6-7 and 14-15 depend from claims 4 and 11, respectively. Applicant respectfully submits that Weinberg, Ingrassia and Hubert do not teach or suggest *a web page with a first software facility including a reference to a source of computer-executable code for determining a trust proxy setting in a web browser*, as recited in claims 4 and 11.

Hubert is cited by the Examiner to provide teachings for the limitations recited in dependent claims. Hubert, however, does not teach the determination of trust proxy settings in the web browser. Hubert does not teach or suggest a web page with a first software facility including a reference to a source of computer-executable code for determining a trust proxy setting in a web browser, as recited in the claimed invention. Nowhere in Hubert mention the use of a proxy.

In light of the foregoing arguments, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Weinberg, Ingrassia and Hubert does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 4 and 11. Claims 6-7 and 14-15, which depend from claims 4 and 11, respectively, are not rendered obvious over the cited prior art references. Applicant therefore

requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 6, 7, 14 and 15, and pass the claims to allowance.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance. Applicant believes no fee is due with this statement. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 12-0080, under Order No. SMQ-064 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: April 13, 2006   Respectfully submitted,

                                               By _____
                                               EuiHoon Lee
                                               Registration No.: L0248
                                               LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP
                                               28 State Street
                                               Boston, Massachusetts 02109
                                               (617) 227-7400
                                               (617) 742-4214 (Fax)
                                               Attorney/Agent For Applicant